

MT NEBO WATER AGENCY  
BOARD MEETING

Held via remote conferencing through Zoom Video Communications  
Tuesday, February 16, 2021

CONDUCTING Gene Shawcroft, Chairman

BOARD MEMBERS Gene Shawcroft, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Marty Larson, Genola City  
Warren Peterson, Goshen Valley Local District  
ABSENT - Brett Christensen, Payson City  
Howard Chuntz, Salem City  
Nick Miller, Santaquin City  
Brandon Gordon, Spanish Fork City  
Boyd Warren, Strawberry Highline Canal Co

ALTERNATE BOARD MEMBERS Chris Hansen, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
David Tuckett, Payson City  
Richard Nielson, Utah County  
Chris Thompson, Spanish Fork City  
ABSENT - Paul Munns, Goshen Valley Local District  
ABSENT - Seth Sorenson, Salem City  
ABSENT - Lynn Mecham, Santaquin City

TECHNICAL COMMITTEE Chris Hansen, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Travis Jockumsen, Payson City  
Norm Beagley, Santaquin City  
Richard Nielson, Utah County  
Melanie McVicker, Goshen Valley Local District  
Bruce Ward, Salem City  
Chris Thompson, Spanish Fork City

STAFF Kim E. Holindrake, Payson City Recorder

OTHERS Steven Clyde, Clyde Snow  
Steve Jones, Hansen Allen & Luce  
Sterling Brown, Strawberry Water Users  
Wes Quinton, Goshen Valley Local District  
Richard Tullis, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Jared Hansen, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Dave Pitcher, Central Utah Water Conservancy District  
Ryan Beck, Envision Utah

1. Call to Order

Chairman Gene Shawcroft called this meeting of the Mt Nebo Water Agency Board to order at 7:30 a.m. The meeting was properly noticed.

2. Public Comment Period

No public comments.

3. Approval of Minutes – November 16, 2020 Meeting

Warren Peterson noted changes to line 245 to be parse not parcel and line 249 non-permanent instead of permanent.

**MOTION: Warren Peterson – To approve the minutes as corrected.** Motion seconded by Richard Nielson. Those voting yes: Gene Shawcroft, Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Dave Tuckett, Nick Miller, Brandon Gordon, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

4. Finance Report

Dave Tuckett reviewed the financial memo noting since the last meeting two invoices were paid and revenues included interest. It shows the reserve account (\$5,000), administrative account (\$31,300.67), and Capital Projects - Project 4 account (\$33,445.88).

5. Technical Committee Report

a. Groundwater Database Update

Chris Hansen reported the groundwater database is moving along. There are a couple entities they are working with on equipping wells. The bulk of the entities have started putting in data. We have been working on this for almost a year and have spent about 25% of the budget. A lot of work and meetings are being done remotely because of COVID.

b. Other

No additional reports

6. Water Banking Committee Report

Marty Larson stated the Committee has not met since the Agency meeting in November. He received a notice from the Bureau of Reclamation for a grant that helps with water banking, which is due April 7. He asked if the Agency is interested. He also asked if any other entity is interested in participating on the Water Banking Committee.

Warren Peterson noted this grant seems appropriate for this project. The question is getting in an application and staffing. He asked if it could be tied to Emily Lewis' efforts. There would need to be a project outline for those who want to participate and a budget.

Steve Clyde noted he previously worked with the Provo Office and also Denver in putting a grant application together for \$400,000, which the Legislature matched with \$400,000, to begin the water banking process, move the statute forward, and begin the pilot program. The Agency would certainly qualify for it. He suggested contacting Emily Lewis to work through the application.

Dave Tuckett is willing to help with the application.

**MOTION: Warren Peterson – To authorize the Water Banking Committee chairman to proceed with a grant application.** Motion seconded by Marty Larson. Those voting yes: Gene Shawcroft, Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Dave Tuckett, Howard Chuntz, Nick Miller, Brandon Gordon, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

7. Regional planning efforts in south Utah County and east Juab County

Dave Pitcher stated regional planning efforts have slowed because of COVID; meeting together is more effective. The objective of the Southern Utah and Juab Counties Water Supply and Infrastructure Plan Formulation Project is to work towards the long-range goal of a sustainable regional plan to optimize the water resources that support economic growth and quality of life. The planning approach is an integrated water resource approach. It's easy to combine sources on paper against estimated demands; it's difficult to do it in reality. The hope is to lead to discussions for policy makers to review. This technical approach is not constrained by current institutional policies. Marketing and institutional policies need to be addressed in the future. Existing and future water supplies have been evaluated and compared to projected water demands to address shortages/gaps. Next, infrastructure and water supply options were evaluated to solve the shortages/gaps.

The next step is working with the stake holders and technical committee for input. Then conclusions with financial analysis and strategies. The approach is called scenario planning that goes out to 2065 using the 2017 Kem C. Gardner population projections. Two scenarios, baseline and alternative, were used for each community to project agricultural land conversion, groundwater production, conservation measures, climate change, and water supply to the year 2065. This correlates to demands with corresponding shortages/gaps. The two scenarios are quite different. The key is the next common decisions over the next five to ten years. All of the sustainably available groundwater is used without over drafting it. The Agency's work to create a database and update groundwater models is going to be very important.

He reviewed a typical monthly demand for a community by stacking current water supplies and what could be produced in wells. If looked at on an annual basis, which many do, it would show there is plenty of water. If looked at on a monthly basis with a typical demand, the question is could the supplies be varied in timing when available. Reuse is only applied on those communities with an approved reuse application. On paper, everything above the estimated demand is available for balancing or retiming, but the finished water is still not being met. The conclusion is there will be a need for treated surface water even after using all the possible ground water. It will still be a significant amount of effort to develop ground water to the amount of sustainable development. Monitoring this resource will be very important. This type of analysis has been done on each decade so some communities saw needs for treated water or additional outdoor watering in 2030 or 2040. There needs to be more input and interaction with communities.

Discussion in determining the 50% safe yield. The groundwater database will hopefully refine the model as to the correct 50%. It has been an accepted practice in looking at the inflow and recharge of groundwater basins. It is finding the balance for a sustainable supply in the future.

Dave Pitcher stated in conclusion, the study identifies discussion and input for regional treatment of surface water for drinking water, coordinated water marketing policies as water uses change, possible merits/benefits of managed aquifer storage and recovery, and regional infrastructure decisions.

Following discussions, cost estimates for infrastructure plans and recommendations can be developed.

Gene Shawcroft stated because there are a number of questions and assumptions, the rational is to keep the Agency up to date. Dave Pitcher is looking for comments and input in order to fine tune the study. This effort is to invite participation.

Dave Pitcher stated they will go back to the technical committees and also meet with individuals. It's difficult to go into the details of each community with a big group. They will take the initiative to meet with technical committees and are also open to invitations.

#### 8. Update on Agricultural Water Task Force

Warren Peterson showed who is participating in the Agricultural Water Optimization Task Force particularly the Division of Water Resources, the Department of Agriculture and Food, and Utah State University. They expect to run out of money by the end of the summer and then report in November to the Natural Resources, Agriculture, and Environment Committee. So far, they have looked at the technical on-farm water efficiency. He worries that they haven't taken a more systematic approach in terms of what happens in a basin or water shed, or how to determine a base line for agriculture. They haven't looked at the bigger question of once the water in agriculture is optimized, will more water be available and if so, where does it go and who benefits from it. He feels this group could use more input as they pull things together. Board members should make contact. Information is available at [water.utah.gov/agwateroptimization/](http://water.utah.gov/agwateroptimization/).

#### 9. Update on Watershed Councils

Warren Peterson stated there has been quite a bit of movement with the Watershed Councils since the last meeting. Last year, legislation created the state-wide watershed council and enables the creation of 12 regional councils, which one would be Utah Lake. The Division of Water Rights felt they didn't have enough staff to pull this together so they brought in the Langdon Group for consulting with JUB Engineers and Smith Hartvigsen. The Langdon Group is focusing on developing the state council and working up three pilot local watershed councils. Their proposal is to have kick-off meetings with stakeholders on the state level, draft plans and schedules by end of June, then assess those who need to be involved. Then they will work on regional councils if there is interest. If the Agency wanted to see the Utah Lake Water Council become one of those first organized councils, the Agency could work with the Langdon Group to facilitate doing that. The purpose of these councils is to have a clearing house for water information; they don't have regulatory authority or fund water projects. The contract runs through 2025. The Agency should anticipate some discussion coming into the area. He asked if the Board was interested in having the consultant visit one of the Agency's meetings to give an update and specifics on how it is set up. Dave Pitcher's presentation would be useful to the state watershed council.

Gene Shawcroft stated the sooner the better to having someone attend the next Agency meeting.

Warren Peterson will make the arrangements.

#### 10. Legislative Updates/Changes

Steve Clyde stated it has been a relatively quiet year for water and reviewed several proposed bills and resolutions.

- HB 297, Colorado River Amendments – The State of Utah is creating more of a Colorado River focus group to take over the management issues on the Colorado River. Gene Shawcroft has been appointed to the Upper Colorado River Commission and will assume that role going forward. The bill is designed to look at a variety of things. Many have focused solely on the development of water but that ignores the reality of what is happening on the Colorado River. The state is now 20 years deep into a drought cycle, and probably looking at the first year ever at a lower basin call against the upper basin states to take water to the lower basin. There are ongoing demand management studies and drought contingency plans as well as hydropower generation at risk at both Lake Mead and Lake Powell.
- HB 364, Utah Lake Authority – This is a very difficult, powerful, and usurpation of all land and water authority. It puts the exclusive jurisdiction for the water resources of Utah Lake including its tributaries in the hands of a 13-person board. It takes away the expertise of the Division of Water Rights, takes away local planning and zoning, imposes some tax burdens, and a myriad of other issues. It has the risk of impacting all water rights, the billions of dollars spent on Central Utah and Provo River projects.
- HB 107, Subdivision Plat Amendments – This was brought forward by the agriculture community realizing there is a lot of urbanization happening in areas where there are a lot of irrigation canals and ditches. It tries to get more involvement between irrigation communities, planning and zoning, and land development to help protect easements and the safety and integrity of ditches.
- House Concurrent Resolution 13, Bridal Veil Falls Area – This is to protect the scenic value of Bridal Veil Falls.
- House Concurrent Resolutions 1, Balanced Approach to the Release of Water from Flaming Gorge – It deals with changing the flows from Flaming Gorge because of erosion on banks, damage to the farming community, and other land owners adjacent to the river. It looks at revising the flow and scheduled releases while protecting the endangered fish.
- HB 24, State Engineer Electronic Communications – The purpose is to bring everyone into the modern world to allow electronic communication with state engineer. People are not getting mailed notices in a timely basis.
- HB 131, State Facility Energy Efficiency Amendments – State agencies are required to report on energy efficiency as well as water use and other resource use.
- HB 144, Water Pricing Structure – Representative Carol Spackman Moss has a single constituent in her district with a very large lot, uses a great deal of water, and pays a large water bill. It proposes pricing structures on water. Previously, the Legislature pushed everyone to tiered pricing for the purpose of forcing people to be aware of water usage and conservation. There isn't much interest to be involved with this legislation.

Warren Peterson reviewed two additional bills. These are mega bills with a lot of moving parts, but he doesn't see either moving forward.

- HB 368, State Planning Agencies Amendments – It consolidates the state planning agencies and changes the name of the governor's office of management and budget back to the governor's office of planning and budget. It moves the public lands policy office to the governor's office.
- HB 346, Natural Resources Entities Amendments – It merges DEQ, DNR, and several other agencies. Mega bills with a lot of moving parts and don't see moving forward.

## 11. Envision Utah – Utah County Update

Ryan Beck updated the Board on Valley Visioning. Populations are growing. Utah County will double in population by 2050 and add about one million more people by 2065. A three-phase process was conducted.

Phase 1, Listening (Fall 2018-Spring 2019), included 2,749 people who took the online survey and 12 public workshops engaging over 400 people. People were asked to prioritize items for Utah County's future and managing water came to the top of the list in front of transportation, air pollution, and education. Priority working groups were then created on water quality and quantity, housing, transportation, air quality, agriculture and open space, and workforce and education.

Phase 2, Scenarios (Summer 2019-Winter 2019), created five How and Where We Grow scenarios with 11,000 people weighing in on the future of Utah County. Scenario A looked at past trends over the last 20 years including lot sizes, housing mix, and growth direction. Scenario B included centers where density was added to city centers. Scenario C included westward growth and protecting agriculture to the southeast. Scenario D included southward growth. Scenario E included urban infill and is the densest of all the scenarios with townhomes, condos, and apartments. The public weighted in along with a random sample survey, and Scenario B received the most support with scenarios C and E coming in next. Five water scenarios were also included. Scenario A included traditional landscaping with a .40 average lot size, Scenario B included localscaping with a .22 average lot size, Scenario C included xeriscaping with a .24 average lot size, Scenario D included traditional landscaping with a .23 average lot size, and Scenario E included some localscaping with a .19 average lot size. Results show a lot of support for scenarios B and C, which used less gallons per day. This was good news as far as efficient use of water.

Phase 3, Vision (late 2020) shows what Utah Valley residents wanted for the future including wise water management, convenient transportation choices, clean air, a well-educated population, housing options, local agriculture, and open space and recreation opportunities, which all include vision goals and strategies. A 2050 vision map shows growth for each city. Wise water management states Utah County residents envision a future where wise and optimal use is made of our water resources, so that everyone can enjoy beautiful communities and a high quality of life even as our population grows. It's about reducing our per capita water consumption, allocating sufficient water to support natural ecosystem functions and outdoor recreation, and optimizing water use.

All of this information can be found at [utahvalleyvisioning.org](http://utahvalleyvisioning.org).

(Gene Shawcroft excused. Marty Larson conducting.)

## 12. Other Business

### a. Information/Discussion Items for Future Meetings

### b. Other

No other business.

## 13. Next Meeting – Monday, May 17, 2021

**MOTION: Marty Larson – To move the May 17 meeting to May 10.** Motion seconded by Richard Nielson. Those voting yes: Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Dave Tuckett, Howard Chuntz, Nick Miller, Brandon Gordon, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

14. Adjourn

**MOTION: Warren Peterson – To adjourn.** Motion seconded by Dave Tuckett. Those voting yes: Marty Larson, Warren Peterson, Dave Tuckett, Howard Chuntz, Nick Miller, Brandon Gordon, Richard Nielson. The motion carried.

The meeting adjourned at 8:53 a.m.